(102)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. No. 6728 of 2006

Petitioner		C. H. Masih, S/o Shri M. Masih, aged about 48 years, occupation – Pharmacist in N.T.P.C. Hospital, Korba, resident of Quarter No. AB-700, Block – 4, Yamuna Vihar, Post Office, Jamnipali, Korba, District Korba (CG).
	Versus	
Respondents	1.	National Thermal Power Corporation, Korba, through its General Manager, Post Office, Pragati Nagar, Korba, District Korba (CG).
	2.	Chief Personnel Manager (Personnel Department), N.T.P.C. Korba, Pragati Nagar, Korba, District Korba (CG).
	3.	N.T.P.C. Farakka, through its General Manager at Farakka (West Bengal).
	4.	Shailendra Mukharjee, son of not known, working as Executive Class 1, at N.T.P.C. Hospital, Farakka (West Bengal).

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri**

Shri Gary Mukhopadhyaya, Advocate for the petitioner.

ORDER

(Passed on this 9th day of April, 2007)

1. The petitioner has filed this petition challenging the order dated 26.5.2006 (Annexure P/27), whereby the representation dated 6.3.2006, submitted by the petitioner to the respondent No.1, pursuant to the order dated 9.1.2006, passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 4815 of 1996 has been decided. It has been communicated to the petitioner that his promotion from W6 to W7 grade shall be considered in DPC-July, 2006 in terms of the Channel of Promotion, applicable to the post of Pharmacist in

(103)

Workmen category and in terms of the promotion policy applicable for the workmen category.

2. From the perusal of the impugned order dated 26.5.2006 it is clear that the petitioner was appointed for the post of Pharmacist (W4) in the Workmen category, vide appointment letter dated 26.7.1982 and he had joined his services on 5.8.1982. The petitioner was granted periodical promotions from the post of W-4 to W5 and W5 to W6. Vide letter dt. 8.10.1998 the petitioner was directed to appear in the trade test/interview for promotion from the post of W6 to W7 but he had refused to accept the offer of appearing in the trade test/interview for the promotion.

3. In view of the foregoing, when the respondents have considered and decided the representation of the petitioner in accordance with law, I do not find any merit in this petition, which deserves to be and is dismissed summarily.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur